

10/647,664

- 6 -

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in this Application. All claims stand rejected.

Applicant thanks Examiner for the helpful interview on December 7, 2007, at 11:00 AM EST. Attending the interview were Examiner Bayard, Attorney James Smith and associate Benjamin Sparrow. Examiner Bayard was presented with a draft Reply including remarks regarding the outstanding claim rejections under § 102(e) and § 103(a), which are being submitted herein. Those remarks were discussed, and as a result, Examiner Bayard indicated that the arguments presented overcome the outstanding rejections. Thus, in view of the remarks submitted herein, it is believed that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-3, 6, and 9-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2007/0007941). Claim 1 is directed to a delay locked loop comprising an initialization circuit, where the initialization circuit “after reset of the delay locked loop assures that the phase detector initially changes the delay in a direction away from a first end of the delay range.” An initialization circuit in accordance with one example embodiment is illustrated in Fig. 4 of the Application (Initialization circuit 410) and described in the Specification at page 8, line 5 – page 9, line 16 as well as the Amendment filed on May 31, 2007, at page 7, lines 1-18.

No such initialization circuit is disclosed in Lin. Lin describes a delay locked loop (DLL) as illustrated in Fig. 2, wherein a phase detector 46 compares the phase of input clock XCLK and a feedback clock and controls delay of the delay line 42 based on the comparison. In addition, a timer circuit 40 switches a “test signal” into the forward delay path to measure the time to traverse the path. This measurement is used for configuring the phase detector 46 (Lin, *Abstract* and paragraphs [0009] and [0030]). Nowhere does Lin describe an initialization circuit as recited in Claim 1. For example, the timer circuit 40 is not an initialization circuit as recited in Claim 1. As described at page 3, paragraph [0031] of Lin:

10/647,664

- 7 -

...timer circuit 40 (FIG. 2) asserts 74 a signal STOP which suspends 76 the phase detector 46 (FIG. 2) from making further adjustments to the delay line 42 (FIG. 2). (emphasis added)

The Office Action cites Lin at the Abstract and at page 3, paragraph [0030] for disclosing an initialization circuit as recited in Claim 1. Here, Lin merely describes the timer circuit 40 during initialization mode 60, as shown in Fig. 3. In this mode 60, an initialization counter 66 begins a count. When the count reaches a predetermined value, the timer circuit 40 enters a test mode 72 to begin the test described above. This "initialization mode" is in no way related to an initialization circuit of the present invention: it does not assure a change in the delay of a DLL in a particular direction, nor does it even affect the delay of the DLL. Thus, Lin fails to disclose an "initialization circuit" as recited in Claim 1.

Claims 9 and 13 are believed to be allowable at least for the aforementioned reasons. Regarding claim 9, Lin does not disclose "after reset of the delay locked loop assuring that the delay initially be changed in a direction away from the first end of the delay range." As a result, the § 102 rejection of Claims 1-3, 6 and 9-13 is believed to be overcome, and reconsideration is requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 14 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Yoshimura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,994,934). Given the shortcomings of Lin in disclosing the recited initialization circuit, no combination of Lin and Yoshimura teaches or suggests the present invention. The § 103 rejection of Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, and 14 is therefore believed to be overcome, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

10/647,664

- 8 -

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER


DEC 07 2007

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 
James M. Smith
Registration No. 28,043
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Date: 12/7/7